

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 TODD MICHAEL SCHULTZ,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 MICHAEL C. THOMPSON, et al.,

14 Defendants.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

No. 2:23-cv-03452-JAK (MRWx)

**ORDER RE MOTION FOR LEAVE
TO FILE FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE
(DKT. 39)**

1 Based on a review of the Motion for Leave to File for Judicial Notice (the
2 “Motion” (Dkt. 39)), insufficient good cause has been shown for the requested relief.
3 Therefore, the Motion is **DENIED**, as follows:

4 Plaintiff seeks to have this case designated “complex” under the California Rules
5 of Court. Those Rules do not apply in federal court. If Plaintiff wishes to use any or all
6 of the procedures in the Manual for Complex Litigation, Plaintiff must wait until the
7 appropriate time to file a Rule 26(f) Report. At that time, Plaintiff may meet and confer
8 with Defendants' counsel regarding whether the procedures in the Manual for Complex
9 Litigation may be used, and Plaintiff may state his position in the joint Rule 26(f)
10 Report. *See* Local Rule 26-1. It will be determined at that time whether it would be
11 appropriate to use any of the procedures in the Manual for Complex Litigation

12 Plaintiff also seeks judicial notice of certain materials. The time for Defendants to
13 answer, or move to dismiss, the operative Complaint has not expired. It would be
14 premature to take judicial notice of any materials.

15
16
17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18
19 Dated: July 18, 2023



20 John A. Kronstadt

21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28